

| | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/507,247 | <i>Harry</i> FREDREGILLE ET AL |
| | Examiner Padmavathi v Baskar | Art Unit 1645 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Padmavathi v Baskar. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. Thomas Kowalski. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 October 2001.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed about "consisting of and consisting essentially of" language in the claims. Examiner informed him that she would discuss about this language with the BPS in the tech center and get back to him.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

| | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/507,247 | <i>Haver et al</i> PREDREGILE ET AL. |
| | Examiner Padmavathi v Baskar | Art Unit 1645 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Padmavathi v Baskar. (3) _____.

(2) Mr Thomas Kowalski. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 02 November 2001.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: 9.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: After discussing with the Director John Doll and Biotechnology specialist Brian Stanton, the Examiner indicated to the applicant that "consisting essentially of" language would overcome written description rejection but not 112, 1st rejection. Applicant told the examiner that he would send a draft with the changes made to previously sent amendment and keeping claims with consisting language and make minor changes to claim 24 and further showing support for enzymatic activity of polypeptide and amend method claims to depend from claim 1 and cancel the other claims, so that the application will be ready for allowance.

| | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/507,242 | <i>Hamer Joe</i> FREDREGILL ET AL. |
| | Examiner Padmavathi v Baskar | Art Unit 1645 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Padmavathi v Baskar. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. Thomas Kowalski (voice mail). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 9/11/0 and 11/16/01.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner called the attorney of record after reviewing the proposed amendment(draft) and informed him that the changes made to the claims were different than the proposed changes discussed on 11/2/01. Since there is not enough time left for responding to the amendment filed on 8/30/01, the examiner will send the office action (message left again on 11/16/01).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

| | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/507,242 | HANES ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Padmavathi v Baskar | 1645 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Padmavathi v Baskar. (3) _____

(2) Mr. Thomas Kowalski. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 04 December 2001.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: After receiving the final rejection the attorney of record wanted to discuss the claims sent on 11/8/01. Applicant discussed about the claim language "consisting essentially of" and function of the polynucleotide SEQ.ID.NO. 1.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required